## Approved For Release 2005/12/24: CIA-RDP80B01495R000100020002-0\_2505\_70 CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY Washington, D.C. 20505

1 2 OCT 1970

Joe DA

Mr. Philip J. Farley, Deputy Director United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Washington, D. C. 20451

Dear Phil:

We had no trouble with the paper. In general, we find it thoughtful, well reasoned and long overdue. We have, however, some suggestions for improvements in presentation. We feel that the approaches to the arms control problem as it relates to the Chinese Communists are described in a somewhat pell mell order. These various proposals are not really a "package" and need not be dealt with in one bundle. Moreover, the timing factor is likely to be an important one, and this problem is not dealt with in the paper as it now stands.

Of course we cannot be certain how exactly the Chinese will react to any or all of these proposals. Much will depend on context—on how the talks develop, on what other subjects come under discussion and whether or not progress is made in dealing with them, and on how precisely the arms control issue is raised in the talks. These are at this point all imponderables, and it is therefore

25X1

impossible to tell at this point whether the Chinese will bite. It seems fairly certain, however, that they will be interested in most, if not all, of the proposals canvassed in this paper. We agree with you that the idea of mutual renunciation of force declaration is the most promising of the several proposals—with the proviso that it is presented in a bilateral, rather than a multilateral context. The idea of a Peking-Washington "hot line" as an opening gambit.

We would doubt that the idea of drawing Chinese scientists into a series of "private" arms control discussions similar to the Pugwash meetings of the mid-1950's is likely to go far. We do not believe that ideas discussed in such a forum would "percolate up" in China today. In addition, it is unlikely that Chinese scientists would be allowed to discuss disarmament matters with U. S. scientists unless a very high-level decision were made in Peking--and this in turn would depend on progress in the official talks. This seems to us the forum in which U. S. ideas on arms control should be raised.

Apart from these minor caveats, we find the paper useful and concur in its thrust and its conclusions.

Sincerely yours,

/c/ R. J. South

R. J. Smith Deputy Director for Intelligence

## Approved For Release 2005/12/24 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000100020002-0

SUBJECT:	Brief for	Arms	Control	Negotiations	with
Communict China					

Communist China

ODDI/ tb (9 Oct 70)
Distribution:
Original & 1 - Addressee
1 - D/OCI

(1)- DDI (ACDA File) w/basic

1 - ODDI Chrono

Approved For Release 2005/12/24 : CIA-RDP80B01495R000100020002-0

25X1 25X1 DATE: 9 October 1970

A
C
T
DA Paper
I
O
R to Phil Farley.

25X1

SUBJECT:

то:

FROM:

CIA Review of ACDA Paper

Approved Fac Beles se 2005/12/24D AIA-RD 80B01495

REMARKS:

The attached letter to Phil Farley, prepared for your signature, is based on OCI's review of the ACDA paper: "The US and Communist China: A Brief for Arms Control Negotiations," which was sent to the Director by Farley. (The letter is the first item under the Basic tab). The comments were prepared by and have been reviewed by I did not change their comments but simply reworked them into a letter format to respond to Farley's letter.

Eventually the ACDA paper, which is being massaged by the working group, will surface as a NSSM. At that time the Agency will be asked to formally approve the paper in the usual manner. In the meantime, Farley had asked for our comments—and here they are.

Letter retyped 10 oct with corrections and revisions pproved For Release 2005/12/24: CIA-RDP80B01495made by you on lorday.

020002-0

25X1 25X1

0020002-0